

RE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION Anizona Corporation Commission 2 DOCKETED WILLIAM A. MUNDELL **CHAIRMAN** 3 JIM IRVIN MAR 3 0 2001 **COMMISSIONER** 4 MARC SPITZER DOCKETED BY COMMISSIONER IJ٢ 5 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DOCKET NO. T-03924A-00-0646 6 ZONE TELECOM, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO PROVIDE DECISION NO. 63523 7 COMPETITIVE RESOLD INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES EXCEPT LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES **ORDER** 9 Open Meeting 10 March 27 and 28, 2001 Phoenix, Arizona 11 BY THE COMMISSION: 12 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the 13 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that: 14 FINDINGS OF FACT 15 On August 30, 2000, Zone Telecom, Inc. ("Zone" or "Applicant") filed with the 16 Commission an application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("Certificate") to provide 17 competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services, 18 within the State of Arizona. 19 2. In Decision No. 58926 (December 22, 1994), the Commission found that resold 20 telecommunications providers ("resellers") were public service corporations subject to the 21 jurisdiction of the Commission. 22 Applicant is a Delaware corporation authorized to do business in Arizona. 3. 23 Applicant is a switchless reseller, which purchases telecommunications services from 24 AT&T. 25 On November 2, 2000, Applicant filed Affidavits of Publication indicating compliance 5. 26 with the Commission's notice requirements. 27 On January 4, 2001, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed its Staff 6. 28

Report in this matter.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 7. Staff stated that the Applicant provided audited financial statements of its Parent Company, e-Kong Group Limited ("e-Kong") for the year ended December 31, 1999. Those financial statements list assets of \$22.6 million, shareholders' equity of \$21.7 million, and a net loss of \$9.7 million. Based upon this information, Staff believes that Applicant lacks adequate financial resources to be allowed to charge customers any prepayments, advances or deposits without establishing an escrow account or posting a surety bond. The Applicant filed a letter with the Commission on October 2, 2000, stating that it does not charge its customers for any prepayments, advances or deposits.
- 8. The Staff Report stated that Applicant has no market power and the reasonableness of its rates would be evaluated in a market with numerous competitors.
 - 9. In its Report, Staff recommended the following:
 - (a) Applicant should be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications services;
 - (b) Applicant should be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as required by the Commission;
 - (c) Applicant should be ordered to file with the Commission all financial and other reports that the Commission may require, and in a form and at such times as the Commission may designate;
 - (d) Applicant should be ordered to maintain on file with the Commission all current tariffs and rates, and any service standards that the Commission may require;
 - (e) Applicant should be ordered to comply with the Commission's rules and modify its tariffs to conform to these rules if it is determined that there is a conflict between the Applicant's tariffs and the Commission's rules;
 - (f) Applicant should be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations of customer complaints;
 - (g) Applicant should be ordered to participate in and contribute to a universal service fund, as required by the Commission;
 - (h) Applicant should be ordered to notify the Commission immediately upon changes to the Applicant's address or telephone number;

2021222324252627

28

DECISION NO. 63523

- (i) Applicant's intrastate interexchange service offerings should be classified as competitive pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1108;
- (j) The rates proposed by the Applicant in its most recently filed tariffs should be approved on an interim basis. The maximum rates for these services should be the maximum rates proposed by the Applicant in its proposed tariffs. The minimum rates for the Applicant's competitive services should be the Applicant's total service long run incremental costs of providing those services as set forth in A.A.C. R14-2-1109; and
- (k) In the event that the Applicant states only one rate in its proposed tariff for a competitive service, the rate stated should be the effective (actual) price to be charged for the service as well as the service's maximum rate.
- 10. Staff recommended approval of the application subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) Applicant should be ordered to file conforming tariffs within 30 days of an Order in this matter, and in accordance with the Decision;
 - (b) Applicant should be required to file in this Docket, within 18 months of the date it first provides service following certification, sufficient information for Staff analysis and recommendation for a fair value finding, as well as for an analysis and recommendation for permanent tariff approval This information must include, at a minimum, the following:
 - 1. A dollar amount representing the total revenue for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by the Applicant following certification, adjusted to reflect the maximum rates that the Applicant has requested in its tariff. This adjusted total revenue figure could be calculated as the number of units sold for all services offered times the maximum charge per unit.
 - 2. The total actual operating expenses for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by the Applicant following certification.
 - 3. The value of all assets, listed by major category, used for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by the Applicant following certification. Assets are not limited to plant and equipment. Items such as office equipment and office supplies should be included in this list.
 - (c) Applicant's failure to meet the condition to file sufficient information for a fair value finding and analysis and recommendation of permanent tariffs shall result in the expiration of the certificate of the tariffs.
- 11. On August 29, 2000, the Court of Appeals, Division One ("Court") issued its Opinion

in <u>US WEST Communications</u>, Inc. v. Arizona Corporation Commission, 1 CA-CV 98-0672, holding that "the Arizona Constitution requires the Commission to determine fair value rate base ("FVRB") for all public service corporations in Arizona prior to setting their rates and charges."

- 12. On October 26, 2000, the Commission filed a Petition for Review to the Arizona Supreme Court. On February 13, 2001, the Commission's Petition was granted. However, at this time, we are going to request FVRB information to insure compliance with the Constitution should the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court affirm the Court's interpretation of Section 14. We are also concerned that the cost and complexity of FVRB determinations must not offend the Telecommunications Act of 1996.
- 13. No exceptions were filed to the Staff Report, nor did any party request that a hearing be held.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. Applicant is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Applicant and the subject matter of the application.
 - 3. Notice of the application was given in accordance with the law.
- 4. Applicant's provision of resold intrastate telecommunications services is in the public interest,
- 5. Applicant is a fit and proper entity to receive a Certificate for providing competitive intrastate telecommunications as a reseller in Arizona.
- 6. Staff's recommendations in Findings of Fact Nos. 9 and 10 are reasonable and should be adopted.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application for Zone Telecom, Inc. for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for authority to provide competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services, shall be and the same is hereby granted, except that Zone Telecom, Inc. shall not be authorized to charge customers any prepayments,

6 7

9

10

11

8

12 13

15 16

14

18

17

19 20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

advances or deposits. In the future, if Zone Telecom, Inc. desires to initiate such charges, it must file information with the Commission that demonstrates the Applicant's financial viability. Staff shall review the information provided and file its recommendation concerning the financial viability. Staff shall review the information provided and file its recommendation concerning financial viability and/or the necessity of obtaining a performance bond within thirty (30) days of receipt of the financial information, for Commission approval.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Zone Telecom, Inc. shall comply with the Staff recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact Nos. 9 and 10.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Zone Telecom, Inc. shall file the following FVRB information within 18 months of the date that it first provides service. The FVRB shall include a dollar amount representing the total revenue for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers Zone Telecom, Inc. following certification, adjusted to reflect the maximum rates that Zone Telecom, Inc. requests in its tariff. This adjusted total revenue figure could be calculated as the number of units sold for all services offered times the maximum charge per unit Zone Telecom, Inc. shall also file FVRB information detailing the total actual operating expenses for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers Zone Telecom, Inc. following certification. Zone Telecom, Inc., shall also file FVRB information which includes a description and value of all assets, including plant, equipment, and office supplies, to be used to provide telecommunications service to Arizona customers for the first twelve months following Zone Telecom, Inc.'s certification.

25

DECISION NO. 63523

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision, Zone Telecom, Inc. shall notify the Compliance Section of the Arizona Corporation Commission of the date that it will begin or has begun providing service to Arizona customers. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately. BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION. Mulell CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this 30th day of March, 2001. AN C. MeNEIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY DISSENT AG:mlj

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: ZONE TELECOM, INC. 2 DOCKET NO .: T-03924A-00-0646 3 4 Lawton Bloom ZONE TELECOM, INC. Woodland Falls Corporate Center 200 Lake Drive East, Suite 200 Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002 Marissa G. Repp HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP 555 Thirteen Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20004 Attorney for Applicant 10 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel Legal Division 11 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street 12 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 13 Deborah Scott, Director **Utilities Division** 14 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street 15 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

28